App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1930.31 (Law)

File No. 167-30

Serial Nos. 1—4

Later References

16

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. Four

Part B for July 1931

SUBJECT.

Speeches delivered by Messrs S. K. Settur and K. Rangiengar in the Market Chowk at Trichur on 21.3.31.

---

4) To the D.M. Trichur

No. PS63 & 30.4.31.

Points out- that instructions to subordinate magistrates to expedite the disposal of pending cases fall under the ordinary functions of a D.M. and adds that the further progress of the cases may be watched and initiated by Govt- in due course.

D.M. - Attend Appy & 13-8-31

CONFIDENTIAL.

5943/30

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Tel. Address :
"ALACRIS"
PHONE NO. 298

No. Pol 1
Encs.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE
IN MYSORE,

Dated Bangalore, 28th March, 1931.

From

F. A. HAMILTON, ESQ., C.I.E.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

To

P. MAHADEVAYYA, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Law Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. Pol.1 dated 19th March. 1931, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of report received from the District Superintendent of Police, Tumkur, with his memo No. H.C. 515/29-30 dated 25th March, 1931, regarding a meeting held in the Market Chowk at Tumkur on 21st March, 1931, whe Advocate Mr. S.K. Setlur presided. The lecturer Mr. K.Rangiengar is reported to have said on the occasion that there was no Swarai in Mysore State and that it was their duty to agitate for the establishment of a democratic form of Government where the Governme is conducted by the people, for the people.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE.

OFFICE OF THE
SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
1 APR. 1931
No. 9051

DEWAN'S OFFICE
5529
4 APR. 1931

Dewan

DEWAN'S OFFICE
S/105
14 APR. 1931

5) Subject with reference to the remarks made on 6.4.31.

×H:K Subsequently on 26.3.31, the D.C. Magistrate has reported that he has issued no prohibitory orders under S. 144 Cr.P.C. barring public meetings.

×H:J&L. 6) Kindly reference is also invited to the report of the said D.C. dt. 13.3.31 in which he has stated that he has ordered the prosecution of the barristers mentioning Messrs. K. B. Deogaonkar:

D.M.
10/4/31

Dewan

12-4-31

7) In case Messrs. N. L. Abhyankar & Deogaonkar shall engage in Political matters

8) Please inquire
D.M.
13/4

9) Draft D.O. letter to D.H. for approval.

Secy)

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
14 APR. 1931
No. 9468

10) Mr. Pennell before leave
D.M.
14/4

2nd Member

Ber 14/4/31 Issued today
D.M.
15/4

D.O. No. 554 dt. 15-4-31 to the
Hon. Private Secretary

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. of 193 .

Serial No.

D. O letter No: S/. 39/29-30 dated 24th April from Mr. V. Ramaswami, D. M. Tumkur stating that the cases against 1) Mr. K. Rangaiengar, 2) " S. K. Letchumanayyam, 3) " T. Subramanyam, 4) " Yejman S. Siddappa in the Spl: I Mgte's Ct, Tumkur are booked to 7. 5. 1931 & that the two cases against (1) & (3) in the Madhugiri Court are booked to 11-5-1931 and that he has communicated "to the Magistrate the desire of Government that all these cases should be quickly decided"

11) With respect to "A" Secy was remarked on the P. U. D. "There was no need for it. He should have done it as Dist Magte." SD: P. M. 25/4

Draft D.O, is put up as per
12) instructions

Secy)

DAP 28/4

Mason submitted

13) typed DO as revised.

D. M. 25/4

14) I am rather disappointed with the performance of Mr. D. M. He himself exercises no vigilance on such cases as he ought to, and when Govt. draw attention to his own duties he does not

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03563—G P B—50,000—8-7-30

wish to accept responsibility for two
new instructions to the Sub-Magistrates &
intimate to the latter that it is the
desire of Govt that such cases should
be quickly decided.

OFFICE OF THE
THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL
27 APR. 1931
No. 7492

15) The Sub-Magistrates had kept such
D.O. correspondence on their files, contrary
to rules, as was done by the City Magistrate
(Mr. N. Narayanaswamy Naidu). Everybody
who sees that file sees that correspondence
and defence lawyers make a hue & cry
that Govt is in league with the judiciary!

16) A draft reply to the D.O. is submitted for consideration.

P.M. 27/4/31

3rd Member
Draw.

17) B 27/4/31

P.M. 28/4/31

18) M. was very forlorn of Mr. D.C.
I have written in Mon terms the
Magistrate.

Mn
29-4-31

Issue D/6
P.M. 30/4/31

OFFICE OF THE
SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
11 MAY 1931
No.

D.O. No. 563/P. Dated 30.4.31
to the D.C. Tinnevelly issued.

19) Subs for perusal.
P.M. 11/5

B
15D 13/5

2nd Member

20) 11/5/31 P.M. 11/5

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Law

File No. 167-30

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Serial No. 556

No.

Confidential.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

To

Date of issue 15.4.31

Dear Sir,

I am to invite reference to my two Hebbikar's letters No: S.R. 39/29-30 of the 13th March 1931 reporting that action was being taken to prosecute Messrs: Ramiengar Subramanyam, Setlur and Gurumanjia ~~for the offences~~ under Sec 188 I.P.C. for ~~their~~ having spoken at certain meetings in spite of the prohibitory order under Sec 144 Cr. P. Code issued on 24'

Signed by M P. Le

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

[over

February 1931. I am to enquire at what stages the several Cases are at present. Government desire that the cases should be decided quickly and should not be allowed to drag on unnecessarily.

This may kindly be treated as immediate & confidential

Yours truly

P. M.

H. V. Ramaswami Esq MABL
District Magistrate
Tanjore

Confidential.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
TUMKUR DISTRICT.

D. O. No. S1.39/29-30

Dated, Tumkur, the...23rd April.....1931.

DEAR SIR,

With reference to your D.O. letter of the 15th instant, enquiring at what stages the several cases launched under Sec. 188 I.P.C. against Messrs. K. Rangaiengar and others, are at present, I write to state that the cases - against the marginally noted first four persons on the file of the Special 1st Class Magistrate - (IInd Court)Tumkur, and those against persons Nos. 1 & 3 on the file of the Special 1st Class Magistrate, Madhugiri, stand adjourned to 7-5-1931 and 11-5-1931 respectively for reasons explained - by the Magistrates concerned in their D.O. letters dated - 20-4-1931 - (Copies enclosed). I have communicated to the Magistrates the desire of Government that all these cases - should be quickly decided.

TUMKUR:-
1. Mr. K. Rangaiengar,
2. " S. K. Setlur, } Advocates.
3. " T. Subrahmanyam.

4. " Yejaman Siddappa - (Merchant)

MADHUGIRI:-
~~1~~. Mr. K. Rangaiengar.
~~2~~. " T. Subrahmanyam

In this connection I may state that no case has

has been launched against Mr. Gurunanjiah, Advocate, referred to in your letter under advertance.

Yours sincerely,

K. V. Ramaswamy

P. Mahadevayya, Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

Secretary to Government of Mysore,

Law Department, BANGALORE.

* (1) Copy of D. O. letter dated 20-4-1931 from the Special First Class Magistrate(2nd Court), Tumkur to the Deputy Commissioner, - Tumkur District.

---------*----------

" With reference to your D.O. No.S1.39/29-30, dated 18-4-31, I beg to state that the statements of the persons have been recorded in all the cases and the cases stand adjourned to 7-5-31. The prosecution evidence has to begin on that day. The cases could - not be heard on the last date of hearing(14-4-31)as I was on casual leave. Every endeavour will be made to dispose of the cases as - early as possible."

---

* (2) Copy of D.O. letter dated 20-4-1931 from the Special 1st Class Magistrate, Madhugiri, to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur Dt.

----------*----------

" I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th instant(D.O.S1.39/29-30). I received it yesterday at Pavagada.

The two cases under Sec.188 I.P.C. against Mr. Rangaiengar and Mr. Subrahmanyam were instituted in my Court on 13-3-31 and they have been registered as C.C.253/30-31 and C.C.254/30-31 respectively. As the alleged offence was said to have been taken place in Sira, I posted both cases to Sira Camp and sent summonses requiring the two accused to attend Court at Sira on 24-3-31. Since they reside in Tumkur, I had to send summonses to Tumkur - Police. The endorsementss on the summonses show that they were secured only on 23-3-31. Both accused had, in their endorsements on the duplicate of the summonses, pleaded that the service of the process upon them was so late that they could not attend Court on the 24th and prayed that I might give them another date. As I felt that the service had been effected very late, I ordered fresh summonses on the 24th of March on which date both of the accused were absent. The fresh summonses requiring them to attend Court at Sira on 6-4-31, and 9-4-31 respectively were served upon them at Tumkur by the Tumkur Police. On 6-4-31, the accused in C.C. 254 i.e, Mr. Subrahmanyam was present at Sira and he represented that he would move for a transfer of the case to some other Court. On that day, Mr. Rangaiengar,(accused in C.C.253)was absent but Mr. Subrah-

Subrahmanyam represented Mr. Rangaiengar as the latter's counsel and urged, as defence counsel, that he had to move the High Court for a trans[redacted] of this case also to some other Court. Under Sec.526(8)Cr. Pr. Code, I was bound to grant adjournments in both of these cases so that petitions for transfer might be filed and accordingly I adjourned them to 11-5-31 to Sira Camp. On 6-4-31, Mr. Subrahmanyam for himself in C.C.254, and as defence counsel in C.C.253, undertook that he and Mr Rangaiengar would attend Court on 11-5-31 without fail and submit themselves to a trial, in case no transfer application was filed in the meanwhile. Till now, the records in either of the cases have not been called for by any superior Court and I am not aware if any petition for transfer has been filed or not.

So far as I am concerned, I can state that I will try my best to prevent unnecessary procrastination of the trial of the cases."

"C O P Y".

Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District.

563 P 30/4/31 Law 167-30-4 12

CONFIDENTIAL.

Dear Sir,

With reference to your confidential D.O.letter No.Sl.39/29-30 of yesterday's date forwarding a report as to the progress made in the several cases against Mr. K.Rangaiengar and others under Section 188 I.P.C and intimating that you have communicated to the magistrates the desire of Government that all these cases should be quickly decided, I am directed to point out that there was no need to ~~have~~ send such a communication. Instructions to subordinate magistrates to expedite the disposal of pending cases fall under the ordinary functions of a District magistrate, and ~~could~~ should have been issued as such omitting ~~all references to~~ Government.

I am to add that the further progress of the cases may be watched and intimated to Government in due course.

Yours sincerely,

To

H.V.Ramaswami, Esq., M.A.,B.L.,
District Magistrate, Tumkur.